

in this state. You undoubtedly know that I am a graduate in medicine and was licensed to practice it in the State of Maryland in 1907. The "M. D." after my initials in the local telephone directory was added about ten years ago, at the suggestion of the local manager of the company, in order to avoid daily annoyance from telephone calls for a local plumber resident here. His initials were the same as mine.

I know that neither the local manager of the telephone company nor I had the remotest idea that the inclusion of the letters "M. D." after my name in the list of patrons of the telephone company could possibly be regarded as a violation of the state Medical Practice Act. Moreover, after carefully considering the paragraph of this act, which you thoughtfully enclosed, I cannot believe that any violation is involved by that and successive acts of the telephone company. I readily concede that you and Mr. Davidson undoubtedly are more familiar with the interpretation of this law than I am, but I fail to see how the printing of a name in ordinary type, and without financial consideration, by a commercial company, could possibly make anyone guilty, as you and Mr. Davidson seem to think it does. The directory of the company surely is one thing, and advertisements in it quite another. Moreover, those initials did not appear in any subsequent directory with my especial knowledge or consent.

Under the circumstances, it must greatly interest you to know that my name appears in the same way in official publications of Stanford University, in most of the scientific periodicals in which I have published articles for the last two decades and over, in scientific programs, upon the roster of scientific societies, etc., etc. Hence, if my name as it appears in the local telephone directory violates the Medical Practice Act of the State of California, then surely all the other appearances also do so, and I stand guilty of your charge many times, both with and without my knowledge and consent.

Although it is now wholly immaterial to me whether my name continues to appear in this form in the local directory, I cannot hesitate to express my conviction that the state Medical Practice Act must be unconstitutional if it denies me the right to use the title of Doctor of Medicine in this and similar ways, for it was legally and lawfully acquired. Moreover, I am ready to take steps to test the constitutionality of that act if this privilege is denied me. In fact, Doctor Pinkham, the thing is so ridiculous as to be laughable, and had Mr. Davidson not requested me but last week to testify in a case to come before the board about July 10, I should have been compelled to conclude that you and he had, for some reason wholly unknown to me, joined forces to reflect seriously upon my character. Surely someone must have had a bad dream, or some local friendly enemy, whose existence is unknown and unsuspected by me, must have led Mr. Davidson and you astray. For it is exactly such overzealous activity for the protection of our profession that has so often brought discredit and public scorn upon it, both at home and abroad.

Since you do not mention it I presume you have none, but if you have one iota of real evidence, or if you know of any charges implying that I ever violated any of the medical practice acts of this state, I shall fully expect you to inform me without delay. I ask this especially since I am about to leave for a vacation of some weeks in the mountains.

Since both my character and integrity are involved in the charge brought against me in your letter, I am sending a copy of your letter, with its enclosure, and my reply to President Wilbur and to Doctor Phillips, the president of the State Board of Medical Examiners.

With cordial regards,

Very sincerely yours,
A. W. MEYER.

**Subject of Following Letter: President Phillips'
Letter to Doctor Meyer**
Board of Medical Examiners
State of California

Santa Cruz, California,
September 6, 1928.

Dr. A. W. Meyer,
Stanford University,
California.

Dear Doctor Meyer

Yours of August 28 received. I delayed answering till I could see Doctor Pinkham. You will appreciate the fact that I am not in touch with the current board correspondence down here in Santa Cruz.

When I received your first letter I spoke to Doctor Pinkham, and looked upon the matter as a simple one; a removal of the M. D. in the telephone book would settle it.

Of course you will understand we do not make the laws, we are only administering them. It seems a necessary restriction. If all were M. D.'s, and situated as you are, there would be no need for it. Unfortunately that is not the case, and we who are dealing with these matters constantly, know what would happen were it otherwise. The restriction does as much to protect the profession as the laity.

Please rest assured you were not singled out by Doctor Pinkham for discipline. There is no discipline about it, but, in the discharge of his official duties, he must take cognizance of such matters as are reported to him. I am sure you and he will arrive at an amicable understanding. . . .

Yours sincerely,
P. T. PHILLIPS.

* * *

**Subject of Following Letter: Doctor Meyer's
Letter to State Board Secretary**

September 13, 1928.

Dr. P. T. Phillips,
Santa Cruz, California.

Dear Doctor Phillips:

I greatly appreciate your friendly letter of September 6 and fully realize the good intentions of the board. I will always be ready to facilitate your difficult task in every possible way, but I do not believe that admitting the false accusation against me can possibly redound to the good of our profession. I regret that I cannot recognize the validity of the interpretation of the board for competent, impartial authorities whom I have consulted since your letter was received hold that the state Medical Practice Act was not violated by the way my name was printed by the telephone company in its local and metropolitan list of patrons.

The language of the law necessarily is broad, but there is nothing in it which declares that such an insertion of my name is an advertisement and that, if I understand correctly, is what is implied in the accusation. I realize, of course, that the board did not make the law, but I hope and believe that it was consulted. Moreover, representatives of our profession undoubtedly formulated the bill and requested its passage and hence we cannot justly shift the responsibility for it upon others.

Since I am enclosing a copy of my letter to the secretary of the board, Doctor Pinkham, regarding the matter, I will merely add my warmest regards to you and your son, whom all of us remember very pleasantly.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
A. W. MEYER.

* * *

**Subject of Following Letter: Doctor Meyer's
Letter to State Board Secretary**

September 13, 1928.

Dr. C. B. Pinkham,
State Board of Medical Examiners,
Sacramento, California.

Dear Doctor Pinkham:

There has been a few days' delay in my response to your letters of July 14 and August 31, which were mailed on September 4 and received on September 6,